

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application, and the suggestions for amending the application. The Examiner is also thanked for the courtesy of the interview granted Applicants' attorney. The topics discussed at the interview are included in the Examiner's Interview Summary and hereinbelow.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

With regard to the objections to the specification and claims, the foregoing amendments should render such objections and rejections moot.

Claims 1 – 17 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over USP 5,949,968, hereinafter Gentile.

According to one aspect of the present invention, a plurality of compression methods are available for ***each type of region***, i.e., character, graphic, and photographic. One of the plurality of compression methods is selected for processing each region. Claim 2 relates to different types of objects.

The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended to clarify that there are a plurality of compression methods for each type of data or object, and a compression method is selected from among the plurality for each type of region or object. For example, claim 1 now includes a compression method selection unit for selecting from among a plurality of compression methods, one of the plurality of compression methods for each region for the compression process to be performed for each region, wherein the selection unit selects the compression method in accordance with a type of the region from among the plurality of compression methods, and ***wherein for each type of region, the selection unit selects a***

compression method only from compression methods in the plurality of compression methods that are designated for the type of region.

Although Gentile may teach using a different processing method for each type of region, Gentile does not teach or suggest providing a *plurality* of processing methods *for each type of region* and selecting a particular one of the plurality of methods for each region. For example, Gentile only suggests using the LZW technique for text, only suggests runlength encoding for graphics, and only suggests JPEG for images. See column 5, lines 21 – 25. Thus, Gentile does not teach or suggest selecting one of a plurality of compression methods (schemes, as used in Gentile) for each type of region.

Accordingly, the claims of the present application are patentable over Gentile.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections. In the event that there are any questions concerning the amendments, or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 5, 2008

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620